

2007 Annual Report

Citizen's Transportation Oversight Committee



F. Rockne "Roc" Arnett, Chairman ■ Jack W. Lunsford, Member at Large ■ Terry Rainey, Maricopa County Dist. 1
Jeffrey A. Schwartz, Maricopa County Dist. 2 ■ Nelson Ladd, Maricopa County Dist. 3
Leyton Woolf, Maricopa County Dist. 4 ■ Peggy Jones, Maricopa County Dist. 5

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Section 1: Introduction & Program Update	1
Citizen's Transportation Oversight Committee.....	1
Regional Transportation Plan Life Cycle Program	2
Major Milestones in 2007	3
Program Changes in 2007.....	5
Program Trends	6
Design Concept Reports and Environmental Studies	7
Roadway Design Projects.....	8
Section 2: Administrative.....	9
Meetings	9
Member Information.....	10
Administrative Agenda Items.....	10
Section 3: Informational Agenda Items	14
Program Related Items	14
Studies	18
Transit and Other Subjects	21
Section 4: Appendix	24
Appendix A : Program Changes in 2007	25
Appendix B : CTOC 2007 Issues Database.....	26
Appendix C : CTOC Statute.....	27
Appendix D : 2005 Performance Audit Status	28
Appendix E : CTOC Budget.....	29
Appendix F : January 2008 Certification Map	30

SECTION 1 INTRODUCTION & PROGRAM UPDATE

CITIZEN'S TRANSPORTATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (CTOC)

On April 21, 1994, House Bill 2342 established a Citizen's Transportation Oversight Committee (CTOC) to facilitate citizen involvement in the decision making process of freeway planning and construction. Their primary responsibilities included review and advisory functions concerning the Regional Transportation Plan, the Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP), changes to the plan, and on the priorities regarding Proposition 300 freeways for corridor and segment development. An annual audit must be performed by an outside audit firm of the expenditures of the Regional Area Road Fund (RARF), along with necessary public hearings. Members were appointed for a period of three years by each of the governing bodies of cities and towns and tribal councils in Maricopa County. The Governor appoints a Chairperson and a Member at Large. Staff and coordination support was to be provided by the Special Assistant for the Regional Freeway System.

House Bill 2172 was passed in 1996 that repealed the existing CTOC and created a new seven member CTOC with the same statutory responsibilities as the original committee. The new CTOC is authorized to; review and make recommendations regarding any proposed major revision to the MAG Transportation Improvement Program; consult with the State Auditor General regarding the required Performance Audit of the Regional Freeway System; receive and make recommendations to MAG regarding citizens complaints relative to MAG's statutory responsibility over the Regional Freeway System; and receive, review and make recommendations to the State Transportation Board regarding citizens complaints about the Regional Freeway System. The seven-member committee consists of five members appointed by each of the members of the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors. The Governor appoints a Chairman and Member at Large. Members previously appointed by the local jurisdictions under the old legislation could opt to complete their original term.

Arizona House Bill 2456, which was passed in the spring 2004 session of the Arizona Legislature, redefined the role of the CTOC. The CTOC Board will be involved in all matters relating to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The RTP is a comprehensive multi-modal and coordinated regional plan. The RTP covers all major modes of transportation from a regional perspective, including freeways/highways, streets, public mass transit, airports, bicycles and pedestrian facilities. The RTP is developed through a cooperative effort among government, business and public interest groups.

A.R.S. § 28-6356 provides CTOC's new roles. The CTOC Board plays a number of important roles in the regional transportation process. It reviews and advises MAG, RPTA and the State Transportation Board on matters relating to the RTP; the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP); the ADOT Five-Year Construction Program and the Life Cycle management programs. This includes making recommendations on any proposed major amendment of the RTP, on criteria for establishing priorities, and on the Five-Year Performance Audit of the RTP. The CTOC Board will conduct an annual Financial Compliance Report of expenditures from the Regional Area Road Fund, the public transportation fund and receive the auditor's report.

The CTOC Chairperson is a voting member of the MAG Regional Council and Transportation Policy Committee on matters related to the Regional Freeway System and Regional Transportation Plan, and a nonvoting member of ADOT's Priority Planning Advisory Committee.

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN LIFE CYCLE PROGRAM

Arizona House Bill 2292, which was passed in the Spring 2003 session of the Arizona Legislature, established the Transportation Policy Committee which was tasked with developing a Regional Transportation Plan for Maricopa County, and established the process for an election to extend the current half-cent County Transportation Excise Tax. The Regional Transportation Plan includes both new freeway corridors to serve growth in the region and improvements to the existing system to reduce current and future congestion. The Regional Transportation Plan also addresses quality of life issues such as noise mitigation, maintenance, litter control and landscaping. The Regional Transportation Plan has three major components: Freeways/Highways, Transit and Arterial Roads.

On November 2, 2004, voters in Maricopa County approved Proposition 400 to extend the existing half-cent Sales Tax for transportation for an additional twenty years to 2026. The current tax expired December 31, 2005. The extension began January 1, 2006.

The Regional Transportation Plan Freeway Program (RTPFP) is funded by three primary revenue sources: the extension of the Maricopa County Transportation Excise Tax (often referred to as the one-half cent sales tax or Regional Area Road Funds RARF), the Arizona Department of Transportation's (ADOT) funds dedicated to Maricopa County and federal funds.

Per A.R.S. § 42-6105.E, 56.2 percent of all sales tax collections will be distributed to freeways and state highways; 10.5 percent will be distributed to arterial street improvements; and 33.3 percent will be distributed to the public transportation fund.

The RTPFP Life Cycle Program includes both new facilities and improvements to the existing system. Operation and maintenance of the system are also addressed. Projects include new freeway corridors, additional lanes on existing facilities, new interchanges at arterial cross streets, high occupancy vehicle ramps at system interchanges, noise mitigation and maintenance and operations programs.

The concept of a Life Cycle Program refers to a programming approach that forecasts and allocates funds through the full life of a major funding source. The Life Cycle Program covers the project program through fiscal year 2026, and reflects a fiscal balance between anticipated revenues and expenditures. The Life Cycle Program provides the necessary management tools to ensure both ADOT and MAG maintain realistic planning and construction schedules, predicated upon funding, and provide periodic reports to the public and other governmental agencies.

MAJOR MILESTONES IN 2007

- ❑ The Papago Freeway (I-10) at Bullard Avenue Traffic Interchange (TI) construction project was advertised in January 2007 and awarded in April 2007.
- ❑ The Piestewa Freeway (SR51) from Shea Boulevard to the Pima Freeway (SR101L) HOV construction project was advertised in January 2007 and awarded in April 2007.
- ❑ The Black Canyon Freeway (I-17) from 16th Street to Buckeye Road system preservation project was advertised in February 2007 and awarded in April 2007.
- ❑ The Black Canyon Freeway (I-17) at SR74 TI reconstruction project was advertised in February 2007 and awarded in April 2007.
- ❑ A system wide, ramp metering construction project was advertised in February 2007 and awarded in April 2007.
- ❑ The Price Freeway (SR101 Loop) from Guadalupe Road to Santan Freeway (SR202 Loop) Freeway Management System construction project was advertised in February 2007 and awarded in May 2007.
- ❑ Quiet Pavement Phase IX construction project was advertised in February 2007 and awarded in April 2007.
- ❑ SR87 from Forest Boundary to New Four Peaks construction project was advertised in April 2007 and awarded in June 2007.

- ❑ The Red Mountain Freeway (SR202 Loop) from University Drive to Southern Avenue landscape construction project was advertised in April 2007 and awarded in June 2007.
 - ❑ The Pima Freeway (SR101 Loop) from Princess Drive to Red Mountain Freeway (SR202 Loop) construction project was advertised in May 2007.
 - ❑ The Superstition Freeway (US60) from Gilbert Road to Power Road was opened to traffic in June 2007.
 - ❑ The Red Mountain Freeway (SR202 Loop) segment from University Drive to Southern Avenue including completion of the US60/SR202 Loop TI was opened to traffic in June 2007.
 - ❑ US93, Wickenburg By-Pass construction project was advertised in June 2007.
 - ❑ The Pima Freeway (SR101 Loop) at 64th Street TI construction project was advertised in June 2007.
 - ❑ SR85 from Mile Post 139.01 to MP 141.71 construction project was advertised in June 2007.
 - ❑ The Agua Fria (SR101 Loop) from Northern Avenue to 31st Avenue landscape construction project was advertised in June 2007.
 - ❑ The Maricopa Freeway (I-10) at SR347 TI improvement construction project was advertised in July 2007 and awarded in August 2007.
 - ❑ The Black Canyon Freeway (I-17) from SR101 Loop to Jomax Road construction project was advertised in September 2007 and awarded in December 2007.
 - ❑ The Papago Freeway (I-10) from Sarival Avenue to SR101 Loop construction project was advertised in October 2007 and awarded in December 2007.
 - ❑ The Red Mountain Freeway (SR202 Loop) from Power Road to University Drive landscape construction project was advertised in October 2007 and awarded in December 2007.
 - ❑ The Black Canyon Freeway (I-17) from Jomax Road to SR74 construction project was advertised in November 2007 and awarded in January 2008.
 - ❑ Quiet Pavement Phase X construction project was advertised in November 2007 and awarded in January 2008.
-

- ❑ The Maricopa Freeway (I-10) from Southern Avenue to SR143 construction project was advertised in December 2007.
- ❑ The Pima Freeway (SR101 Loop) from Tatum Boulevard to Princess Drive construction project was advertised in December 2007.

PROGRAM CHANGES IN 2007

The detail information are shown in Appendix 'A'.

- ❑ Updated design, Right-of-Way and construction costs based on latest estimates.
 - ❑ Modified some design and RW project schedules to align with study schedules.
 - ❑ Modified limits of existing Red Mountain corridor projects based upon implementation plan identified in DCR.
 - ❑ Established new RW projects which were identified during studies.
 - ❑ Established erosion control and roadway improvement projects on the SR87 corridor.
 - ❑ Established spot improvement congestion management project on the I-10 corridor at the Broadway curve.
 - ❑ Established TI improvement project on the I-10 corridor at the SR347.
 - ❑ Established an advance bridge widening project on the Red Mountain Corridor for better coordination with Light Rail construction.
 - ❑ Minor project name changes to reflect updated project limits.
 - ❑ Advanced project on the Agua Fria Freeway (SR101 Loop) at Union Hills Drive through HELP Loan.
 - ❑ Established privately funded project on the I-10 corridor to construct a new traffic interchange at Desert Creek and 395th Avenue.
 - ❑ Established landscape construction project on the I-10 corridor from Sarival Avenue to Dysart Road.
 - ❑ Established drainage improvement project on the Pima Freeway (SR101 Loop) from Hayden Road to Princess Drive.
 - ❑ Established new design project on the South Mountain Freeway (SR202 Loop).
 - ❑ Established an HOV study project for the MAG Regional Freeway System.
 - ❑ Deferred drainage improvement project on the I-17 from Peoria Avenue to Greenway Road to align with roadway widening construction schedule.
 - ❑ Deferred construction schedule to align with design schedule for various projects.
-

- ❑ Deferred design project to align with study schedule for various projects.
- ❑ Separated funding for design project from construction project for various projects.
- ❑ Separated funding for utility relocation and R/W acquisition from construction project for various projects.
- ❑ Repackaged Freeway Management System (FMS) projects on the Pima Freeway (SR101 Loop).

PROGRAM TRENDS

The 2007 Certification confirms that the revenues and costs are in balance. However, the Department is conducting a comprehensive review of costs and revenue projections for entire Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Freeway Program.

Based on preliminary assessment, the projected costs to complete the RTP will exceed projected revenues. The Department will analyze the financial impact to delivering the RTP. It is anticipated that the July 2008 Certification will reflect the cost updates for the balance of the RTP Freeway Program.

For the year 2007, revenue growth rates for the Transportation Excise Tax Revenues have slowed compared to previous years. This is primarily due to weaker than anticipated retail sales in Maricopa County.

The 2007 bid amounts on several Regional Transportation Plan Freeway Program construction projects came close to or lower than ADOT's estimates with more bids received compared to previous years. Construction material costs have appeared to stabilize from the rapid increases that have been seen over the last three years. Although the increases have moderated, there has not been a significant decline for key commodities to previous levels.

Based on numerous studies currently underway, construction and R/W costs for two new freeways (South Mountain and Bob Stump Memorial Parkway, SR303 Loop) and major corridor improvement projects (I-10 and I-17) reflect significantly higher costs than initial estimates, which were developed in 2003. These higher estimates are due to increased costs for construction materials and substantial increases in real estate values, which result in higher right of way costs. Scope refinements identified during design studies have also led to certain cost increases. The Department will have better information to determine the magnitude of cost increases as studies progress. If these cost increases continue long term, they will have a substantial impact on the program and the Department's ability to deliver the program as currently planned, within the originally anticipated timeframe.

ADOT will monitor and review these trends closely and will continue assessing the potential financial impact to the program.

DESIGN CONCEPT REPORTS AND ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES

An Environmental Overview is underway for the I-10 corridor between SR101 Loop and I-17. The study includes adding general purpose lanes.

A Design Concept Report (DCR)/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is underway for the I-10 corridor between SR51 and the Santan Freeway (SR202 Loop). The study includes freeway widening for express and local lanes.

A Project Assessment (PA) is underway for the I-17 corridor at the Happy Valley Road TI and the Pinnacle Peak Road TI. The study includes TI improvements.

A DCR/EIS is underway for the I-17 Corridor between I-10 and SR101 Loop. The study includes freeway widening concepts.

A DCR/Categorical Exclusion (CE) is underway for Grand Avenue (US60) between the Agua Fria Freeway (SR101 Loop) and McDowell. The study includes minor roadway improvements.

A Feasibility Study/Environmental Overview is underway for the Grand Avenue (US60) between SR303 Loop and SR101 Loop. The study includes various roadway improvements.

A DCR is underway at the SR85/I-8 TI. The study includes a divided roadway concept and a new interchange configuration.

A DCR/CE is underway for the Pima Freeway (SR101 Loop) between Princess Drive and SR202 Loop. The study includes adding general purpose lanes.

An EIS/DCR is underway for the South Mountain Freeway Corridor (SR202 Loop). The study includes the construction of a new freeway.

A DCR/Environmental Assessment (EA) is underway for the Bob Stump Memorial Parkway (SR303 Loop) between the I-10 Reliever (SR801) and I-10. The study includes the construction of a new freeway.

A DCR/EA is underway for the Bob Stump Memorial Parkway (SR303L) between I-10 and Grand Avenue (US60). The study includes the construction of a new freeway.

A DCR/EA is underway for the I-10 Reliever (SR801) between SR85 and the South Mountain Freeway (SR202 Loop). The study includes the construction of a new freeway.

A DCR/Environmental Document is underway for the Williams Gateway Freeway (SR802) between SR202 Loop and Meridian Road. The study includes the construction of a new freeway.

ROADWAY DESIGN PROJECTS

Major design work continues on the following projects:

Corridor	Project Location	Length (Mile)	Design Status
I-10, Papago	Verrado Way – Sarival Ave.	6	Stage III
I-10, Papago	Sarival Ave. – Dysart Rd.	4	Stage III
I-17, Black Canyon	Dove Valley Rd.	TI	Final
I-17, Black Canyon	SR74 – Anthem Way	5	Stage III
US60, Grand Ave.	99 th Ave. – 83 rd Ave.	2.5	Final
US60, Grand Ave.	SR303L – 99 th Ave.	10	Stage III
US60, Superstition	I-10 – SR101L	5	Final
SR74	MP20 – MP22	2	Stage III
SR85	Southern Ave. – I-10	2	Stage IV
SR101L, Price	SR202L (Red Mountain) – SR202L (Santan)	8	Final
SR202L, Red Mountain	SR51 – SR101L	10	Design-Build
SR202L, Red Mountain	SR101L – Gilbert Rd.	6	Stage III
SR202L, Red Mountain	Washington St. & Mill Ave.	Bridge Widening	Final
SR303L	SR303L/I-10 TI	TI	Stage II
SR303L	Thomas Rd. – Peoria Ave.	8	Stage III
SR303L	Cactus Rd., Waddell Rd. and Bell Rd.	TIs	Stage III
SR303L	Peoria Ave. – Bell Rd.	4	Stage III
SR303L	Bell Rd. – US60, Grand Avenue	3	Stage III
SR303L	Lake Pleasant Rd. – I-17	7	Stage IV
SR303L	Happy Valley Rd. – Lake Pleasant Rd.	7	Final

Stage I: 15% Plan

Stage II: 30% Plan

Stage III: 60% Plan

Stage IV: 95% Plan

Final: 100% Plan

SECTION 2 ADMINISTRATIVE

CTOC statutory authority and responsibilities are defined in the Arizona Revised Statutes, A.R.S. § 28-6356 (shown in Appendix 'C'). This section of the report provides a summary of CTOC membership and regular CTOC administrative responsibilities.

MEETINGS

The Citizen's Transportation Oversight Committee (CTOC) met six times in 2007 including one joint public hearing. The Committee reviewed and discussed a broad range of topics.

The regular CTOC meetings for January, March, June and September were held at the Arizona Department of Transportation, Transportation Board Room, 206 South 17th Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona.

The regular CTOC meeting for November was held at the Chandler Main Library, 22 South Delaware Street, Chandler, Arizona.

A Joint Public Hearing with the Maricopa Association of Governments Regional Council (MAG), the Regional Public Transit Authority (RPTA) and the State Transportation Board (STB) was held at the MAG Offices at 302 North 1st Avenue, in Phoenix, Arizona. The meeting dates follow:

Tuesday, January 30, 2007

Regular Meeting

Friday, March 9, 2007

Joint Public Hearing at MAG

Tuesday, March 20, 2007

Regular Meeting

Tuesday, June 19, 2007

Regular Meeting

Tuesday, September 25, 2007

Regular Meeting

Tuesday, November 27, 2007

Regular Meeting at Chandler Library

MEMBERS

The following is a list of current members as of December 2007.

<u>MEMBER</u>	<u>TERM EXPIRES</u>
F. Rockne "Roc" Arnett, Chairman	January 2008
Jack W. Lunsford, Member at Large	January 2008
Terry Rainey, Supervisor's District 1	June 2010
Jeffrey A. Schwartz, Supervisor's District 2	March 2010
Nelson Ladd, Supervisor's District 3	January 2008
Leyton Woolf, Supervisor's District 4	March 2010
Peggy Jones, Supervisor's District 5	May 2010

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA ITEMS

Arizona Open Meeting Law

Attorney General's Office gave a PowerPoint presentation on Open Meeting Law. A hard copy of the presentation was given to each Board member. He stated the statute for the Open Meeting Law is Arizona Revised Statute § 38-431.

- He commented that all meetings of a public body shall be open to the public and anybody who wants to attend should be allowed.
 - Every committee has to give initial public notice of the meetings which tells the public where the agenda will be filed. It is to be posted with the Secretary of State Office for state public bodies but is not limited to this location. Depending on the committee the requirements may vary.
 - Practicalities are to double check that you posted one, that you can find it and that it is current.
 - Initial (Public) Notice - a twenty-four hour notice is required.
-

- It's a good idea to post the agenda with the notice. The agenda needs to list items to be discussed, considered or decided at the meeting. The public body may discuss, consider or make decisions only on the agenda and other matters related to them. Typical problems with agendas include legalese, acronyms, technicalese such as language a regular person would not understand.
- The Executive Session is limited in its scope and use. It's a portion of a meeting that would be held outside of the general public and would be put on the agenda but need not contain information that would defeat the purpose of the Executive Session or compromise the attorney-client privilege.
- Posting pitfalls - include posting inside locked buildings at 5:00 p.m., posting behind glass, failure to post the front and the back and posting where someone can "borrow" the notice.
- Possible problems with meeting locations are location and size. It is acceptable to move your meeting to another place close by if you outgrow the room as long as people are able to find it.
- The public has the right to attend the meeting, listen to the meeting and tape record or videotape. The public does not have the right to speak or disrupt the meeting.
- You want to make a good record on warnings given. Video or audio taping is a good idea in this situation.
- Calls to the Public are allowed but not required. If you have a Call to the Public, the only responses allowed are responding to criticism, asking staff to review a matter and asking that a matter be placed on a future agenda. You can limit the time allowed to individual speakers depending on what the Committee finds reasonable and the circumstances such as size of audience. You may require a speaker on the same side of an issue with no new comments to select a spokesperson. You may set ground rules in regard to civility, language and treating everyone the same.
- You can put a brief summary of current events on the agenda. A current event needs to be put as a summary on the agenda and if a presentation, you can't move on to discuss, deliberate or take legal action. Unless you need to have an Executive Session it might be preferable to have the discussion with the public so they know what is going on.
- Executive Sessions - are private but not secret. "Attendees" are found in the definition section in A.R.S. § 38-431 (2) and include members of the Board, officer, employees and those individuals whose presence is reasonably necessary in order for the public body to carry out its Executive Session responsibilities; the Auditor General and persons subject to personnel discussion.
- Executive Session pitfalls include failure to keep Executive Session discussion confidential and failure to advise persons about the confidentiality requirement. Put a reminder on the agenda for the chair to recite every meeting. You cannot vote in Executive Session and note on the agenda that following the Executive Session, you may return to the public meeting in order to further discuss and take action on what was discussed within the Executive Session. Make sure sufficient

information is in the minutes and they are to remain confidential and must be kept from all but a limited number of people. You can conduct a personnel evaluation in Executive Session. It is not an opportunity to have a Board policy discussion that should take place in an open meeting. You can interview candidates for a position in Executive Session and you must discuss and vote for appointment in a public session.

- Legal advice is the most common use for Executive Session. The presence of an attorney at an Executive Session cannot be used to circumvent the open meeting law requirements. Legal advice encompasses advice given to the public body regarding the legal ramifications of the facts and information given to the attorney and the legality of the proposed legislation and includes the propriety, phrasing, drafting and validity of proposed legislation, including its meanings, legal scope, possible legal challenges and counsels' views.
 - What is not allowed includes any discussion regarding the merits of the case after legal advice is given. Also not allowed - includes debate over what action to take, discussion of pros and cons of actions, talk of policy implications of competing actions. These must take place in public sessions. The public body has the burden of proving actions fall within an Executive Session exception to the Open Meeting Law.
 - Quorum - defined is a majority of the members appointed to a Board. Empty seats do count as part of the number. "Splintering" the quorum becomes important with e-mail, parking lots, telephones, polling, not-quite-polling and committing your vote. This must be done only in a meeting. The same limitations apply to staff. Sanctions may be imposed upon any person who knowingly violates the Open Meeting Law.
 - Social Events - if more than a quorum may be present, you may want to post a courtesy agenda, include a statement that no business will be discussed or action taken and Board members should avoid talking with each other or have a third party present.
 - Meeting Etiquette - includes be careful whispering to other board members, passing notes, letting members of the public talk to each member before the meeting starts with their hands over the microphone.
 - Minutes or recording are required for every meeting. It's a good record of what happens should any question come up in the future. You must include the date, time and place of the meeting, members present and absent, a general description of matters considered, accurate description of legal action, names of members who propose action, names of persons making statements or presenting material and a reference to the legal action.
 - A sign-in sheet is not mandatory but is appropriate to make it available. Three working days after the meeting a recording or the minutes need to be available for inspection by the public. The Executive Session minutes or recording shall be kept confidential and shall include the same information as for public sessions. Certain sanctions may be imposed for violations to the Open Meeting Law including penalties, attorneys' fees and possible removal.
-

Financial Compliance Audit

ADOT spoke regarding the requirements and standards for the Annual Financial Compliance Audit. Time has been spent meeting with the Auditor General's office for an opinion of whether or not the last audit complied with statutory laws pertaining to the auditing of all financial actions associated with the implementation of the Regional Area Road Funds. It was stated that the Auditor General's Office will attend the next meeting to express their legal opinion on this issue. Handouts on "Accounting for Governmental and Nonprofit Entities" and Agreed-Upon Procedures Engagements were distributed. Deloitte & Touche, LLP, provided a summary of the auditing process. Deloitte does four financial audits for separate financial reports on ADOT and these are rolled into the State's audit. Federal compliance procedures are followed. An audit is the highest level of test an auditor can make, stating whether financial statements are materially correct. "Agreed Upon Procedures", are done in relation to the Citizens Transportation Oversight Committee's compliance with the Arizona Revised Statutes. Those procedures are determined by the management of ADOT/CTOC and were determined historically with the idea of meeting the statute. Upon those procedures being set, auditors perform and record specifically what procedures are done and outcomes of those procedures. There is not an overall conclusion. A Financial Statement Audit is more complex than Agreed Upon Procedures. Not all transactions can be audited. A sampling is statistically based. What we do with "Agreed Upon Procedures" is what the management asks me to do as long as they relate to what auditors can do. We report on those findings with those procedures.

CTOC Budget

Copies of the Proposed CTOC Budget for Fiscal Year 07/08 were distributed to the Committee members along with last year's budget for their reference.

\$20,000 has been allotted for Personal Services, \$7,000 for Employee Related expenses; \$17,000 for Professional and Outside Services; \$1,000 for In-State Travel; \$7,000 for Other Operating Expenses and \$1,000 for Non-Capital Equipment for a total budget of \$53,000. Budget Report in Appendix E.

SECTION 3 INFORMATIONAL AGENDA ITEMS

There were numerous presentations made to CTOC that provided the Committee and the public with background information and an opportunity to discuss and comment on a variety of transportation issues. The following is a list of a number of the agenda items presented at the meetings in 2007.

PROGRAM RELATED ITEMS

STAN Funding

The STAN is Statewide Transportation Acceleration Needs funding. This past legislative year, House Bill 2865, presented the STAN account to the legislature for approval. They provided \$307 million for construction of various projects in and around the State of Arizona and included freeways, highways, bridges, interchanges, etc. Of that distribution of \$307 million, 60 percent or \$184.2 was designated for Maricopa County, 16 percent or \$49.1 million to Pima County and the other thirteen counties received the balance, 24 percent or \$73.7 million. In each of those cases, those projects identified had to be included in the Regional Transportation Plan, or in Pima, the Pima Association of Governments Transportation Plan and the remaining counties had their own highway planning document that needed concurrence. An important aspect of deciding which projects should be eligible and included in the STAN recommendation included: in Maricopa County, they had to be included in the Regional Transportation Plan and have to be project ready, i.e. environmental documentation, design work or sufficient other engineering studies underway to define what the project would be. ADOT previously identified projects that have been through sufficient scoping and environmental review so that funding could be obligated within approximately the next 24 months. For construction projects, the final design process had to be underway or could be started immediately. For right-of-way projects, project readiness meant that corridors have already been identified in sufficient certainty to allow acquisition of right-of-way to occur in the same time frame. A handout was shared identifying the five construction projects and one right-of-way project. On I-17, a project from SR 74, Carefree Highway north to Anthem Way, \$33.1 million was designated. It had been scheduled for 2024. It was advanced in this process to 2009. The second project, in the west valley, on I-10 from Verrado Way to Sarival Road to construct general purpose lanes and a continuation of other improvements on the interstate. From Loop 101, proceed westerly to the Loop 303 Interchange and it will be consistent with the construction proceeding to the east. \$46.9 million was designated for these 5.7 miles in lanes and it had been scheduled for 2023 and advanced to 2009. In the east valley, an HOV project from Princess Drive to the Red Mountain Freeway

Traffic Interchange, adding HOV lanes from Tatum Boulevard to Princess Drive; allowing in concert with the construction of the HOV lanes on SR 51, a continuous HOV lane connection north connecting to the Loop 101, proceeding east to the Red Mountain Freeway. The second project approved was the Loop 101 Price Freeway between Baseline Road and Santan Freeway, another \$38.5 million. Both were advanced to 2008. Several other projects in the west valley, the Loop 303, Bell Road, a design construction of a partial traffic interchange for \$12 million. Second, south of that area, on Loop 303, Cactus Road and Waddell Road design and construct crossroad improvements for \$10 million. Lastly, advanced right-of-way acquisition on the Williams Gateway project from Santan Freeway, east to Ellsworth Road at \$20.3 million, advanced to 2007. Regarding the approval process, the Transportation Policy Committee recommendation and approval was held on November 15, 2006. The MAG Regional Council, on December 13, 2006, approved the plan. On December 15, 2006, the State Transportation Board concurred and supported the advancement of these projects. MAG and ADOT staff reported to the state legislature, the Senate and House Transportation Committee meetings, their recommendations and there was concurrence and support. The STAN function has been successful in advancing projects, not only in Maricopa County but elsewhere around the State. There are several legislators who said they were satisfied with the first STAN go around and are willing to initiate additional STAN funding. Some east valley legislators are proposing another \$200 million this fiscal year. Another proposal will take \$450 million from the Rainy Day Fund and apply it to the STAN fund. Thirdly, the Governor has her proposal that we extend our 20 year bonding time period to ten more years. If that were approved, we anticipate that will add \$400- \$450 million additional dollars that could be used for STAN. It is unsure which will be approved to move forward.

Update on State Route 153

ADOT provided a PowerPoint presentation update on the proposed major amendment to delete SR153 from the MAG Regional Transportation Plan. The proposal is to transfer ownership of SR153 to the City of Phoenix and take funds that had been programmed for the construction of the completion of that project and use those for additional construction on SR143. Handouts were provided that followed the presentation including the graphic where SR143, also referred to as the Hohokam Expressway and SR153 were described. In the current five-year construction program, there is approximately \$23.5 million funding available for the completion of this project. Approximately two years ago, DMJM+Harris, Inc., was selected to do an extensive engineering and environmental study for the widening of I-10 and south to the Loop 202. The right-of-way that would be necessary for construction from University to Superior Street had already been acquired. As a result of the preliminary Design Concept report and the Environmental document several elements became obvious that there would be complications. The proposed I-10 widening project

includes the addition of local express lanes, a roadway north of I-10 and south of I-10 to provide access for local traffic not using I-10. One of the elements of the design concept is to include the additional freeway lanes north and south of I-10. It concluded the recommended solution would reduce excess traffic currently using I-10 and eliminating existing conflicts and weaving movements. When the City of Phoenix was informed, they asked if they could perform their own traffic study, incorporating Sky Harbor Airport traffic with their future Light Rail plan. Following their two year study, the City sent a formal letter to ADOT and MAG to request a proposal. Reasons to improve SR143 instead include: SR153 would not directly connect to I-10 at 40th Street; higher traffic volumes on SR143; airport security measures; potential use of SR153 for multi-modal transportation facilities and SR143/I-10 connection is better. Major plan amendment next steps include presentations to various ADOT and MAG committees; a 30-day consultation period which began in May and ends in June; all written input will be reviewed and evaluated; MAG action to amend the Transportation Improvement and Regional Transportation Plan are subject to Air Quality conformity analysis; final action to amend the TIP and RTP; final approval by TPC and MAG Regional Council; final approval by State Transportation Board. The City of Phoenix has already agreed to accept SR153 into their street system with no additional improvements by ADOT and to waive the policy of a four-year advising period. Yet to be completed include the consultation process, final approvals and air quality analysis.

Regional Freeway System Status Report

ADOT gave a graphic presentation on the status of the MAG Regional Freeway Transportation Plan Program. The program summary includes FY 2008-2012. ADOT plans to spend \$3.85 billion over the next five years. In 2008, the \$902.9 million programmed is the highest expenditure the Department and MAG have allocated for freeway construction. Included in the \$3.85 billion are 38 miles of new freeways, 133 miles of lane additions and improvements, 75 miles of new HOV lanes, 34 miles of rubberized asphalt and 6 new traffic interchanges. A graphic of projects was shown and includes HOV lanes and general purpose lanes on I-10 between Sarival Road and Dysart Road beginning in FY 08-09 for \$85 million; general purpose lanes on I-10 from Agua Fria Freeway to I-17 in FY 2010 for \$68 million; a collector distributor road on I-10 between 40th Street and Baseline Road in FY 2010 for \$350 million; HOV lanes and general purpose lanes on I-17 from Jomax Road to SR 74 in FY 2008 for \$95 million; general purpose lane on I-17 from SR 74 to Anthem Way in FY 2009 for \$30.5 million; traffic interchange on I-17 and Dove Valley Road in FY 2008 for \$16.6 million; three construction improvements on US 60; traffic interchange on US 60 Lindsay Road in FY 2012 for \$4.2 million; general purpose lanes on US 60, I-10 to Price Freeway in FY 2010 for \$8 million; general purpose lane on SR 85 from I-8 to I-10 in FY 2008-2010 for \$137 million. On State Route 101, traffic interchanges at Beardsley Road and Union Hills Drive in FY 2012 for \$18 million; HOV lane from Tatum Boulevard to Princess

Drive in FY 2008 for \$30 million; HOV lane from Red Mountain Freeway to Baseline Road in FY 2008 for \$17 million and HOV lane from Baseline to Santan in FY 2008 for \$35.5 million. Packaging of programs is being explored. Traffic interchange improvements on SR 143 and SR 202 in FY 2009 for \$32 million will improve access into the airport. Red Mountain Freeway projects include construction of new freeway on SR 202 from 51st Avenue to I-10 West in FY 2009-2011 for \$420 million; general purpose lane on SR 202 from SR 51 to SR 101 in FY 2008 for \$184 million and HOV lane on SR 202 from SR 101 to Gilbert Road in FY 2009 for \$29 million. The South Mountain Freeway has been under study and a draft Environmental Impact Statement is being concluded with anticipation of public hearings next year followed by the request to the Federal Highway Administration to approve the project which is about 26 miles in length. Construction could begin in FY 2009 in the west valley.

Projects on the SR 303 were highlighted and included the TI connecting SR 303 with I-17 at Lone Mountain Road, interim construction on SR 303 from Happy Valley Road to I-17, SR 303 construction of new freeway from I-10 to Grand Avenue and a traffic interchange at SR 303 and I-10 also requiring realignment. Another project in the west valley is along SR 303, a traffic interchange reconstruction by adding an overpass over the future Loop 303 Interchange at Bell Road, Cactus and Waddell Road, utilizing STAN funds with construction beginning in FY 08 for \$20.2 million. During the five-year construction period, the quiet pavement program and funding of the maintenance will continue. Funds will be programmed for right-of-way acquisitions and improvements on traffic interchanges.

STUDIES

Building a Quality Arizona Statewide

Reconnaissance Study

MAG presented the framework studies throughout the State. A map showing the growth projections was shown from 2000 with approximately 5 million people. Based on current trends, projections are made over the next 30, 40 and 50 years. After identifying the private and State trust lands, it is determined how much land is left that can be developed. Approximately one third of the State is left for development. State trust lands represent more than half of the land that is left for development. Today, based on 2005 mid term census, there are about 6.1 million people today. The State is estimated to grow to 16 million people. A lot of development is starting to occur in Mohave County. Fundamental issues include questions such as where are the roads. Do we improve primary routes? Do we improve alternate routes? Do we need new routes and/or corridors? The existing Metropolitan Phoenix Valley has potential build out at 5.5 million with approximately 4 million today. Other major growth areas around the Valley include Hassayampa Valley, Hidden Valley, Northern Pinal County and Superstition Vistas. Including these areas, the Phoenix area is projected to have approximately 13 million people at build out at about a 50-80 year horizon. Translating that to vehicle activity, person trip activities, roughly this population equates to 40 million trips a day of travel. Today, there are 10 million trips on the network. ADOT and the Federal Highway Administration were being requested by the development community in the Hassayampa Valley for traffic interchanges along Interstate-10. A plan for this part of the valley is needed; therefore the result of the Framework Studies. The Hidden Valley Roadway Study is a joint opportunity that MAG is overseeing with ADOT's participation and Maricopa and Pinal Counties and the Town of Buckeye, City of Goodyear and City of Maricopa. MAG has been approached by Yavapai County to look at connections to the north. The Hassayampa Valley will see more than 100 master planned communities. An area of approximately 1,400 square miles was shown and bounded by the Loop 303, SR74, Gila River and 459th Avenue. The County line is 579th Avenue. **Opportunities and constraints were identified.** A conceptual framework was developed and it identified freeways, parkways and major arterials. Potential transit options also were explored. The framework is for discussion of future transportation facilities and connections and is subject to appropriate planning, engineering and environmental studies. The recommendations are not publicly funded. Next steps include developing and evaluating alternatives, formulating a network recommendation and an implementation plan specifically looking at funding strategies and looking at the MAG Regional Council accepting the study in September. Recommendations will include key framework corridors, freeway interchange recommendations, new 'limited-access parkway' recommendations and an implementation strategy. Transportation and land use affect the quality of life such as

job creation, air quality, land consumption and traffic. Arizona has three distinct types of travel, interstate, intrastate and international travel. Patterns emerge when looking at growth. A slide of the U.S. trade patterns in the southwest was shared. A network to support this travel demand is being reviewed. Potential for expanding the interstate system seems to be on the horizon. More rural interstates are going to six or more lanes. Connecting population centers are being reviewed. Phoenix and Las Vegas are the two fastest growing metropolitan areas in the Nation. There is no interstate route between Phoenix and Las Vegas. The Statewide Interstate Mobility Reconnaissance Study will begin to look at a network to support interstate and intrastate travel. This would be a minimum \$75 billion investment. The Study will identify short-term transportation solutions, provide an action plan for establishing a vision for Arizona transportation into the future, describe the link between transportation and economic growth and develop a statewide transportation planning tool. A comparison chart was shared that graphed the State and local government transportation spending as a percentage of gross state products against other states.

Transportation & Infrastructure Moving Arizona's Economy

The T.I.M.E. Coalition, the acronym for Transportation and Infrastructure Moving AZ's Economy. It addresses several of the issues that have been brought forward here. About six months ago, a group of people began meeting in an informal fashion about the notion of transportation infrastructure in the State of Arizona and the lack thereof. The premise of that meeting was in order to address and improve the transportation infrastructure. The driving force had to be relative to the economy. If we are not able to move people and goods and services in a timely manner, then we are adversely affecting our economy and growth and with those projections we will have difficulty in attaining some of those if we can't address that transportation infrastructure. From those informal discussions, a group was formed and it continues to grow, the T.I.M.E. Coalition. It is comprised of a variety of organizations across the State that represents businesses and/or businesses of governments. It will continue to grow and evolve over time. As a result, as it formalized, we adopted a set of principles for the statewide coalition. It comprises a cross section of cities, towns, Native American communities, counties and businesses with the belief that quality transportation drives commerce. It is essential to our economic future. The Coalition must accomplish several things as noted in the handout. Adopted were a set of goals in order to attain the principles. They include identifying funding options to address the long-term needs of the State, establish a process and timeline involving several stakeholders with the hopes of a transportation plan statewide by May 31, 2007; return a statewide transportation plan to the Legislature by December 31, 2007 for approval; place the comprehensive statewide transportation plan on the ballot for the General Election in 2008 or as soon as practically possible and encourage the continuation of the acceleration funding for transportation with the Legislature, starting with the STAN process last year. All modalities at this point remain on the table, as well as all funding sources. We will

identify how much does a tenth of a cent sales tax drive the State of Arizona. How much does a \$1,000 impact fee in the State of Arizona drive? How much does every penny in gas tax drive? The numbers are there; they haven't been compiled to look at the sources. The planning process to determine options is needed and then funding sources can be identified. HB 2682 was considered by the Senate Transportation Committee today and passed 58 to 1 out of the House. The one no vote was concerned that not enough focus was paid to transit. A 24-page amendment was brought to the committee that took three other bills that did not have success and added them to the bill. The three other bills dealt with private investment partnerships and fast lanes, hot lanes. When the chairman called for a vote on the amendment, there were not enough people to pass the amendment. When he called for a vote on the bill, it failed because of party allegiance. The T.I.M.E. Coalition held a meeting and will look at the need for legislation. The purpose of the bill was to get legislative buy in up front. In conclusion, this is driven by a host of organizations in the State that understand the importance in addressing transportation infrastructure. It's a matter of commerce.

Pinal County Study

ADOT Transportation Planning Division presented an update on the Pinal County Study. A PowerPoint presentation and maps were shared. The studies conducted were the Williams Gateway Corridor Definition Study, the US60 Corridor Definition Study and the Pinal County Corridors Definition Study. All three were concluded in 2006 and were for the purpose of identifying need for and feasibility of potential new highway corridors in northern Pinal County. Recommendations were made to the Transportation Board and were incorporated into MoveAZ, the statewide long-range transportation plan. The process included looking at current conditions regarding population, employment, travel and then forecasts were made for 2030. The question of how well will our existing roads meet the needs of the future and it was determined that existing roads will not meet the needs. The next question was what roads would be feasible. Next steps were feasibility analysis, stakeholder meetings and consultation with communities. A decision was made to look beyond 2030, to look at build-out to determine needs. New corridors were identified on a map. Conclusions included widening of existing highways and future state highways. Freeway corridors reflect general locations where future facilities may be located. ADOT began studies that will determine the alignments. Additional corridor definition studies were identified on a map. Feasibility and need are being identified; not alignments. With rapid growth anticipated, alternatives to I-10 are being reviewed. Connectivity with corridors identified further north is important. Multimodal opportunities need to be explored.

Status of East Valley Pinal County Transportation Studies

The growth continues to exceed projections and the growth has expanded outward throughout the valley. The growth continues in Maricopa and surrounding counties including Pinal County. In the last six years, Pinal County is the sixth fastest growing county in the United States. Maricopa County continues to lead. There are numerous new subdivisions in the area of Queen Creek and east of Gilbert, east of Apache Junction. Issues with this growth include transportation. The current mortgage dilemma has taken a toll and commuting has become problematic due to a lack of freeways. Pinal County officials and CAG have made strong approaches and requests of the Department to consider adding or constructing new freeways or other roadways to connect the far east valley with existing communities including the Loop 202 - Red Mountain Freeway. ADOT responded to inquiries and began to study alternatives to address some of the congestion issues. In 2006, ADOT completed three Corridor Definition Studies to address long-range transportation needs. Three broad corridors are currently being studied, the William Gateway Freeway, US 60 bypass of the Gold Canyon area and a north/south connector from US 60 to the Florence/Coolidge area. Extensive input and individual meetings were held. Recommendations reflect general planning-level corridors, not exact alignments. Graphics were shared and described. The dilemma is that the residents of Pinal County as well as elected officials would like to see acceleration of construction. The funds are not available to build all of these freeways at this time. Revenues generated from sales tax are not sufficient to build freeways. There is not a specific timeframe for construction.

TRANSIT AND OTHER SUBJECTS

Governor's Executive Order – Expanding Transit/Transportation Options

ADOT outlined the process and status of the Executive Order. There are three sets of input. The first is to establish a working group, the second is five public meetings and the third group of input is VIP or other one-on-ones. CTOC is included in this third group. Discussions were held with the universities, with the railroads, community leaders and other high level stakeholders to solicit input. The input stage is nearly complete. Key points of the Executive Order include, ADOT is to report within 90 days. The report will include a list of options for mass transit, commuter rail and/or light rail. Identify cost effective options. Include preliminary estimates of the costs of each option. Assess how the private sector could participate and include recommendations on how to finance each option. Supporting strategies include looking at relationship of activities including environmental, local commitment,

congestion relief, jobs created, benefits to State government and employees, land and growth management, return on taxpayer investment, capturing new trips and mode split, introduce public transportation options to the young and to the elderly. A list of the report's content was shown in the power point presentation and includes an executive summary, public transportation program overview, methodology, program recommendations, funding and financing, conclusion and recommendations and appendix/credits/bibliography. Report objectives include: define current public transportation programs and investments, identify strategy for future investments, define investment categories, preliminary cost estimates, identify and encourage the private sector to offer or assist and for any public money, identify financing options. The reporting horizon will be 20 years (FY 2008 through FY 2027), it will understand fiscal limitations, capitalize on reasonable data base in short time and recognize current, existing services throughout the State. A program approach versus a project approach is used as much as possible, focusing on mode application with an investment strategy based upon a future planning process. Mass transit programs were identified and include connecting communities, enhancing rural transportation programs – there are already 17 statewide and this could be doubled, serving elderly and disabled populations in rural areas, Tribal programs, enhancing urban regional mobility, increasing capacity in dense urban environments, sharing rides and van pooling – this can grow from 300 to 1,000, building State infrastructure and planning, marketing and other programs. The Commuter Rail program category includes capacity relief in urban corridors and high speed urban-urban connections for example Phoenix to Tucson. Light Rail includes improving capacity in new urban environments and adding new capacity such as adding more miles or more service. Accelerated projects includes HOV lanes/infrastructure, Light Rail/urban bus programs and bus and passenger facility programs.

The Executive Order is a response to the Governor and will be delivered to the Governor, the Speaker of the House and President of the Senate on April 6th. It will be made available to the public upon the Governor's release.

It's difficult to get the private sector to fund a program that is not yet defined. Private sector involvement should be long-term. In addition, local investments are difficult to identify.

Loop 303 Noise Issue

ADOT addressed a noise issue raised by citizens of Sun City West recently. He presented his report regarding noise levels for homeowners along the Loop 303 and ADOT's future plans. This issue was brought to ADOT's attention during a January informational meeting in Sun City. A graphic was shared outlining the area of concern. Maricopa County Department of Transportation was responsible for the jurisdiction of the Loop 303 construction during the previous five years. Residents began to express their opinion that noise levels were not acceptable and asked for some type of mitigation such as a wall. Technicians initiated noise studies at the homes of the residents and monitored noise existing levels.

ADOT's Environmental Planning Services stated that he met with residents and obtained noise measurements. An aerial visual was shared indicating sites closest to the noise source. Readings were done in April and levels were shared and ranged from 52 to 55 decibels. Federal regulations mandate that mitigation be considered when the noise levels approach 67 decibels. In 1995, the Federal Highway Administration mandated that States develop their own policy. This policy had to be equal to national levels or better. Arizona's noise policy is the top in the country at 64 decibels. Policy sites 64 decibels as the threshold for consideration for mitigation. Traffic noise is an emotional issue affecting different people at different levels. Based on the study, there is not a noise exceedance. Noise levels could increase by three decibels and would still not meet the criteria to mitigate.

City of Chandler – Status of HOV Projects and Light Rail Potential

Assistant Public Works Director stated that the HOV lanes are in design. This project has been accelerated. As freeways become more crowded and gas prices increase, these features are needed. This will help the express bus service coming on line in the near future. A parking and ride lot is under design. The City of Chandler is in the process of updating the City's general plan and comments heard include interest in the potential to extend Light Rail into the City of Chandler. The City joined Valley Metro Rail to participate in planning for future extensions. The South Tempe Corridor Alignment Study is starting, looking at feasibility. These projects add alternatives to the freeway system.

SECTION 4 APPENDIX

APPENDIX A PROGRAM CHANGES IN 2007

APPENDIX B CTOC 2007 ISSUES DATABASE

APPENDIX C CTOC STATUTE

APPENDIX D 2005 PERFORMANCE AUDIT STATUS

APPENDIX E CTOC BUDGET

APPENDIX F JANUARY 2008 CERTIFICATION MAP

APPENDIX A

PROGRAM CHANGES IN 2007

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE FY 2008 - FY 2012 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN FREEWAY PROGRAM

			Fiscal Year		Budget (000)				
Route	Phase	Project	From	To	From	To	Change	Other Misc. Changes (Comments)	Item No.
I-10									
10	RD	40th St - Baseline Rd, CD Road	08	09	\$5,775	\$5,535	(\$240)	Transfer scope and funding for spot improvement congestion management project in FY08. Based on expected duration of study, this design project will not be ready in FY08.	40006
10	RC	40th St - Baseline Rd, CD Road	10	10	\$74,235	\$71,135	(\$3,100)	Transfer scope and funding for spot improvement congestion management project in FY08.	11307
10	RD	Southern Ave - SR143	None	08	\$0	\$240	\$240	Create design project to mitigate congestion on I-10 between Southern Ave and SR143	New
10	RC	Southern Ave - SR143	None	08	\$0	\$3,100	\$3,100	Create construction project to mitigate congestion on I-10 between Southern Ave and SR143	New
10	RD	40th St - Baseline Rd, CD Road	08	09	\$4,125	\$4,125	\$0	Based on expected duration of study, this design project will not be ready in FY08.	13307
10	RD	40th St - Baseline Rd, CD Road	09	10	\$4,675	\$4,675	\$0	Based on expected duration of study, this design project will not be ready in FY09.	40109
10	RC	SR 347 TI	None	08	\$0	\$300	\$300	Create this project from "TI Improvements" subprogram (item# 12708).	New
10	RW	Sarival Rd - Dysart Rd, Outside lane	None	08	\$0	\$3,000	\$3,000	New R/W is needed for construction.	New
10	RD	Desert Creek TI, Private Funds	None	08	\$0	\$1,900	\$1,900	Add privately funded design project into the ADOT 5-Year Program per FHWA requirements. NEPA clearance for change of access requires inclusion in MAG Program.	New
10	RC	Desert Creek TI, Private Funds	None	09	\$0	\$18,500	\$18,500	Add privately funded construction project into the ADOT 5-Year Program per FHWA requirements. NEPA clearance for change of access requires inclusion in MAG Program.	New
US60, Superstition									
60	RD	I-10 - SR101L, Price Freeway	08	08	\$700	\$1,600	\$900	Increase based on latest cost estimates	40308
60	RC	I-10 - SR101L, Price Freeway	10	08	\$8,000	\$19,500	\$11,500	Increase based on latest cost estimates. Design will be ready to advertise project in FY08.	40510
US60, Grand Avenue									
60	RC	SR303L - 99th Ave	09	09	\$40,700	\$35,000	(\$5,700)	Based on latest cost estimates	40309
60	RW	SR303L - 99th Ave	None	08	\$0	\$1,000	\$1,000	New R/W is needed for construction	New
60	RD	SR303L - 99th Ave	None	08	\$0	\$600	\$600	Supplement \$600K for design project	New
SR87									
87	RD	MP 211.8 - MP 213.0	None	08	\$0	\$220	\$220	Create erosion control design project to protect roadway slopes.	New

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE FY 2008 - FY 2012 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN FREEWAY PROGRAM

87	RC	MP 211.8 - MP 213.0	None	08	\$0	\$2,200	\$2,200	Create erosion control construction project to protect roadway slopes.	New
87	RD	New Four Peaks Rd - Dos S Ranch Rd	None	08	\$0	\$2,300	\$2,300	Improvements are needed to meet current ADOT Design Guidelines and/or current AASHTO recommendations.	New
87	RC	New Four Peaks Rd - Dos S Ranch Rd	None	10	\$0	\$23,000	\$23,000	Improvements are needed to meet current ADOT Design Guidelines and/or current AASHTO recommendations.	New
SR101L, Price									
101	RC	SR202L, Rd Mountain - Baseline Rd	08	08	17,000	22,000	\$5,000	Increase due to cost adjustments based upon current bid pricing.	40708
101	RC	Balboa Dr, Multi-use Path, Local	09	12	2,000	2,000	\$0	To align with City of Tempe's schedule (This project is programmed in FY12 in MAG TIP).	16006
SR202L, Red Mountain									
202	RD	Rural Rd - SR101L, WB	08	None	2,600	0	(\$2,600)	Delete this project and transfer scope and funds to new project.	43108
202	RC	Rural Rd - SR101L, WB	09	None	32,000	0	(\$32,000)	Delete this project and transfer scope and funds to new project.	41109
202	RD	I-10/SR51 TI - SR101L, EB	08	None	9,200	0	(\$9,200)	Delete this project and transfer scope and funds to new project.	41108
202	RC	I-10/SR51 TI - SR101L, EB	09	None	105,500	0	(\$105,500)	Delete this project and transfer scope and funds to new project.	41209
202	RD	Rural Rd - SR101L	11	None	1,760	0	(\$1,760)	Delete this project and transfer scope and funds to new project.	41411
202	RC	Rural Rd - SR101L	12	None	33,000	0	(\$33,000)	Delete this project and transfer scope and funds to new project.	41412
202	RD	Rural Rd - SR101L, EB & WB	None	08	0	5,700	\$5,700	Create this project from the deleted project.	New
202	RC	Rural Rd - SR101L, EB & WB	None	09	0	72,300	\$72,300	Create this project from the deleted project.	New
202	RD	48th St - Rural Rd, EB	None	09	0	3,700	\$3,700	Create this project from the deleted project.	New
202	RC	48th St - Rural Rd, EB	None	10	0	46,300	\$46,300	Create this project from the deleted project.	New
202	RD	SR51 - 48th St, EB	None	10	0	4,160	\$4,160	Create this project from the deleted project.	New
202	RC	SR51 - 48th St, EB	None	11	0	51,900	\$51,900	Create this project from the deleted project.	New
202	RD	Mill Ave & Washington St	None	08	0	1,200	\$1,200	Create this design project in FY08 to accelerate bridge widening prior to opening of Light Rail.	New
202	RC	Mill Ave & Washington St	None	08	0	7,700	\$7,700	Create this construction project in FY08 to accelerate bridge widening prior to opening of Light Rail.	New
202	FMS Design	SR101L - SR87	08	08	600	600	\$0	Change name to "SR101L - Gilbert Rd"	41308
202	FMS Const	SR101L - SR87	09	09	6,000	6,000	\$0	Change name to "SR101L - Gilbert Rd"	41409

[illegible]

[illegible]

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE FY 2009 - FY 2012 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN FREEWAY PROGRAM

			Fiscal Year		Budget (000)				
Route	Phase	Project	From	To	From	To	Change	Other Misc. Changes (Comments)	Item No.
I-10, Papago									
10	RD	395th Ave TI, Private Funds	None	09	\$0	\$1,820	\$1,820	Add privately funded design project into the ADOT 5-Year Program per FHWA requirements. NEPA clearance for change of access requires inclusion in MAG Program.	New
10	RC	395th Ave TI, Private Funds	None	09	\$0	\$18,200	\$18,200	Add privately funded construction project into the ADOT 5-Year Program per FHWA requirements. NEPA clearance for change of access requires inclusion in MAG Program.	New
10	RD	Perryville Rd	12	12	\$450	\$750	\$300	Cost update based on latest cost estimates.	40012
10	RC	Sarival Ave - Dysart Rd	09	09	\$35,000	\$59,000	\$24,000	Cost update based on latest cost estimates. Added auxiliary lane from the Bullard Ave TI project. Added outside widening of the Agua Fria River bridge.	43409
10	LC	Sarival Ave - Dysart Rd	None	11	\$0	\$3,200	\$3,200	The landscape work is not included in the roadway widening project.	New
I-10, Maricopa									
10	RD	SR202L, Santan - Riggs Rd	09	09	\$2,310	\$4,000	\$1,690	Cost update based on latest cost estimates.	10103
I-17, Black Canyon									
17	LC	SR101L - SR74, Carefree Highway	10	10	\$3,000	\$5,000	\$2,000	Calculated cost based on \$34,500/acre unit price.	43509
17	Drainage	Peoria Ave - Greenway Rd	09	13	\$17,000	\$17,000	\$0	To align with roadway widening construction schedule.	11407
US60, Grand Avenue									
60	RC	SR101L, Agua Fria - McDowell Rd	10	10	\$27,165	\$29,700	\$2,535	Used inflated amounts	40310
US60, Superstition									
60	RD	Meridian Rd	12	12	\$400	\$800	\$400	Cost update based on latest cost estimates.	40612
60	RD	Lindsay Rd, half Interchange	11	11	\$400	\$800	\$400	Cost update based on latest cost estimates.	40711
60	RC	Lindsay Rd, half Interchange	12	12	\$4,200	\$8,000	\$3,800	Cost update based on latest cost estimates.	40712
SR85									
85	RC	MP 120.54 - MP 122.99	09	10	9,100	9,100	\$0	Design will not be ready to advertise construction project in FY 09.	13607

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE FY 2009 - FY 2012 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN FREEWAY PROGRAM

85	RC	MP 149.4 - MP 152.0	09	10	16,200	16,200	\$0	Design will not be ready to advertise construction project in FY 09.	10209
85	RC	Southern Ave - I-10	09	09	29,600	34,000	\$4,400	Cost update based on latest cost estimates.	20806
99th Avenue									
99	RC	I-10 - MC85	10	10	3,500	2,500	(\$1,000)	Advance \$1 million to FY 09 for creating utilities & R/W project.	11807
99	RU & RW	I-10 - MC85	None	09	0	1,000	\$1,000	Create new project for R/W & Utility work. Utility work and R/W acquisition need to be done prior to roadway project.	New
SR101L, Agua Fria									
101	RD	Beardsley Rd/Union Hills Dr	11	09	700	500	(\$200)	Change project name to "Union Hills Dr (City Advancement)"	40811
101	RC	Beardsley Rd/Union Hills Dr	12	09	18,000	27,500	\$9,500	Cost update based on latest cost estimates. City advancement through HELP loan.	40812
SR101L, Pima									
101	FMS design	I-17 - SR51	11	None	770	0	(\$770)	Delete this FMS design project and transfer both scope and funding to "SR51 - Princess Dr" project.	41011
101	FMS design	SR51 - Princess Dr	11	None	660	0	(\$660)	Delete this FMS design project and transfer both scope and funding to "SR51 - Princess Dr" project.	41111
101	FMS D&C	SR51 - Princess Dr	09	09	1,100	2,530	\$1,430	Transferred scope and funding from two deleted projects.	13609
101	Drainage Const	Hayden Rd - Princess Dr	None	09	0	2,000	\$2,000	Drainage improvements are needed to protect properties adjacent to the freeway.	New
SR143, Hohokam									
143	RD	SR143/SR202L TI	None	09	0	3,600	\$3,600	Create new design project for SR143/SR202L TI construction project.	New
143	RC	SR143/SR202L TI	09	09	34,400	32,100	(\$2,300)	Cost update based on latest cost estimates.	
SR202L, South Mountain									
202	RW	51st Ave - I-10 West	09	09	8,000	20,000	\$12,000	Cost update based on latest cost estimates.	44809
202	RD	51st Ave - I-10 West	09	10	15,000	15,000	\$0	This design project will not begin in FY 09.	44509
202	RD	51st Ave - I-10 West	None	11	0	20,000	\$20,000	Create new design project in FY 11 and use latest cost estimates.	New
202	RD	I-10 East/Santan TI - 51st Ave	09	10	10,000	10,000	\$0	This design project will not begin in FY 09.	41608
202	RD & RW	I-10 East/Santan TI - 51st Ave	09	10	20,000	20,000	\$0	This design project will not begin in FY 09. Change type of work to "Design".	40809
202	RD & RW	I-10 East/Santan TI - 51st Ave	10	10	40,000	50,000	\$10,000	Cost update based on latest cost estimates. Change type of work to "R/W".	41310

7/29/2008

APPENDIX B

CTOC 2007 ISSUES DATABASE

CTOC 2007 ISSUES

<i>Date</i>	<i>Issue Source</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Request Form</i>	<i>Agency Impacted</i>	<i>Issue Type</i>	<i>Summary/Comment</i>
01/05/2007	Joseph Ryan	Light Rail	email	RPTA	Transit	He stressed the disadvantages of Light Rail impeding and lengthening the amount of time everyone will all spend traveling.
01/06/2007	Joseph Ryan	Transportation Planning	email	RPTA	Planning	Suggests an elevated rail system rather than Light Rail on grade level with vehicles, police, fire and pedestrians.
01/16/2007	Mr & Mrs Hall	South Mt. Freeway	email	ADOT	Planning	Suggests we extend Loop 101 southward around South Mountain.
01/30/2007	Terry Rainey	STAN Funding	Meeting minutes	ADOT	Financial	Questioned if ADOT anticipates the STAN funding issues being approved this legislative session.
01/30/2007	Jack Lunsford	Gov's 2nd Exec. Order	Meeting minutes	ADOT	Financial	Requested ADOT give a report at the next CTOC meeting on the Governor's second Executive Order.
01/30/2007	Nelson Ladd	STAN Funding	Meeting minutes	ADOT	Financial	Asked how the Coalitions came up with the \$50 billion dollar short fall estimate for the year 2025.
01/30/2007	Nelson Ladd	Tax Funding	Meeting minutes	ADOT	Financial	Will we be asking for a tax increase 10 to 15 years from now or does the estimated tax run parallel to the project figures.
01/30/2007	Bob McKnight	Transit	Meeting minutes	RPTA	Multimodal	Concerned about the lack of a bus pullout at 20th Street and Washington intersection and also the rest of the Light Rail routes with pullouts.

<i>Date</i>	<i>Issue Source</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Request Form</i>	<i>Agency Impacted</i>	<i>Issue Type</i>	<i>Summary/Comment</i>
01/30/2007	Joseph Ryan	Transportation Planning	Meeting minutes	RPTA	Multimodal	Suggests high-speed, low cost transportation to link Arizona cities to Sky Harbor Airport and light-weight passenger-cargo vehicles.
02/04/2007	Joseph Ryan	Transportation Planning	email	MAG	Planning	Encourages better planning for all future transportation systems in Arizona.
02/25/2007	Joseph Ryan	Light Rail	email	RPTA	Financial	In regard to Light Rail he feels that the Valley Metro Rail, the City of Phoenix and the Sky Harbor People Mover, violates the Record of Decision for federal funding.
03/30/2007	Nelson Ladd	Gov's 2nd Exec. Order	Meeting minutes	ADOT	Transit	Asked about concerns he has with the Governor's Executive Order 2007-2 Expanding Transit to include smog and water issues, and air quality.
03/30/2007	William Crowley	Transit	Meeting minutes	RPTA	Transit	He feels we need bus service that is 24 hours a day and 7 days a week. Also we need 3 to 5 minute service in the center of the city..
03/30/2007	Joseph Ryan	Light Rail	Meeting minutes	RPTA	Transit	Expressed concerns about Light Rail in dangerous location and lack of safety bars. Stated a elevated system would have been the best choice over all.
03/30/2007	Dianne Barker	Transit	Meeting minutes	RPTA	Transit	She feels the general public doesn't have a government that is encouraging them to take transit, and that the trolley needs to be a public/private partnership.
03/30/2007	William Crowley	RPTA 20-Year Plan	Meeting minutes	RPTA	Transit	Expressed concerns about rail, other transit, air quality and the Indian communities being included in the RPTA 20 Year Strategic Plan.

<i>Date</i>	<i>Issue Source</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Request Form</i>	<i>Agency Impacted</i>	<i>Issue Type</i>	<i>Summary/Comment</i>
03/30/2007	Roc Arnett	Gov's Exec. Order	Meeting minutes	ADOT	Transit	Asked if there are preliminary costs estimates for each transit option and if a study on utilization of the private sector vans are included in the report.
03/30/2007	Jim Lykins	Transit	Meeting minutes	RPTA	Transit	Stated that if an effective public transportation system could be built that was convenient and reliable the public would use it more.
03/30/2007	Jack Lunsford	Mass Transit	Meeting minutes	ADOT	Transit	He asked if the subject has been address whether mass transit is a local government funding responsibility or a state responsibility.
04/23/2007	Walt Maas	Noise Loop 303	email	ADOT	Noise	On behalf of himself and other concerned residence he is requested help from CTOC with a high noise level in their neighborhood from the Loop 303.
04/30/2007	Walt Maas	Noise Loop 303	email	ADOT	Noise	He and residence strongly object to the noise study results performed in their area regarding the high noise level from the Loop 303.
05/22/2007	Dianne Barker	Transit Funds	email	RPTA	Financial	She feels Light Rail monies are being mis-managed with the City of Phoenix, RPTA, Valley Metro and the FTA.
06/07/2007	Wayne McGee	Noise Loop 303	email	ADOT	Noise	Complained about the noise levels on the Loop 303 and asking for rubberized asphalt as soon as possible.
06/09/2007	Gary Green	Light Rail Safety	email	RPTA	Transit	Urges those in authority to learn from the safety mistakes in other states regarding Light Rail accidents.
06/18/2007	Joseph Ryan	Light Rail	email	RPTA	Transit	He feels planners for the Light Rail have not considered all the problems with construction and delays in traffic upon completion.

<i>Date</i>	<i>Issue Source</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Request Form</i>	<i>Agency Impacted</i>	<i>Issue Type</i>	<i>Summary/Comment</i>
06/19/2007	William Crowley	More Bus Stops	Meeting minutes	RPTA	Transit	He expressed his desire and the need of more bus stops in the west valley.
06/19/2007	Leyton Woolf	Noise Loop 303	Meeting minutes	ADOT	Freeway	He asked about future increases in noise levels and follow-up noise studies on the Loop 303.
06/19/2007	Joseph Ryan	Noise Issues	Meeting minutes	ADOT	Freeway	Stated that these and other noise issues were brought up a couple of years ago but not enough has been done to alleviate the problem.
06/19/2007	Michael Hernandez	Air QualitySafety	Meeting minutes	ADOT	Air Quality	He feels ADOT does not take the necessary precautions in chemical spraying along freeways.
06/19/2007	Bob McKnight	Freeway Access	Meeting minutes	Local Gov	Planning	He stated that the SR153 doesn't have a decent entrance or exit particularly on the north end.
06/19/2007	Joseph Ryan	Freeway Planning	Meeting minutes	ADOT	Planning	He feels that the traffic interchanges at the Loop 101& I-17 and SR51 & Loop 101 were under built and that it shouldn't have ever happened.
06/19/2007	Dianne Barker	Fin. Comp. Audit	Meeting minutes	CTOC	Administrative	She is concerned about the fact that CTOC law requires a Financial Compliance Audit of all expenditures and not a " Agreed upon Procedures" report.
06/19/2007	Jack Lunsford	I-10 Widening	Meeting minutes	ADOT	Planning	He asked when the I-10 widening studies would be up for CTOC's comments and or recommendations.
08/06/2007	Gary Green	Light Rail	email	RPTA	Transit	With continued safety concerns with our Light Rail he forwarded an article of a small child being critically injured by a Light Rail Train in New Jersey.

<i>Date</i>	<i>Issue Source</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Request Form</i>	<i>Agency Impacted</i>	<i>Issue Type</i>	<i>Summary/Comment</i>
08/08/2007	Joseph Ryan	Light Rail	email	RPTA	Transit	He feels the Light Rail plans our political leaders have won't relieve the terrible congestion of our under-built interchanges and major street crossings.
08/19/2007	Joseph Ryan	S. Mt. Freeway	email	ADOT	Planning	He expressed concern about the alignment of the South Mountain Freeway and additional air pollution created by the freeway.
08/26/2007	Joseph Ryan	Financial	email	MAG/CTOC	Financial	He doesn't feel MAG is doing enough to addressing the \$10 billion dollar shortage in revenue for the current 20-year transportation plan.
09/25/2007	William Crowley	Outreach	Meeting minutes	CTOC	Administrative	He feels CTOC should do more advertising and outreach to the citizens of Maricopa County.
09/25/2007	Nelson Ladd	Chairman's vote	Meeting minutes	CTOC	Administrative	He asked when the Chairman of CTOC votes at MAG meetings if he is voting on behalf of CTOC or himself.
09/25/2007	Joseph Ryan	Rapid Transit	Meeting minutes	RPTA	Transit	He doesn't feel widening freeways is the answer to congestion, he again suggest that we need rapid transit.
09/25/2007	Dianne Barker	Financial	Meeting minutes	ADOT	Air Quality	She commented that funds for air quality are needed for the whole county and that we need good flowing flexible transportation.
09/25/2007	Roc Arnett	Framework Study	Meeting minutes	ADOT	Planning	He asked if the Framework Study could be explained and its status regarding the scope of the statewide transportation needs 40 to 50 years out.
09/25/2007	Dianne Barker	Fin. Comp. Audit	Meeting minutes	CTOC	Transit	She commented on the fact that transit is not covered in the Financial Compliance Audit and it should be.

<i>Date</i>	<i>Issue Source</i>	<i>Issue</i>	<i>Request Form</i>	<i>Agency Impacted</i>	<i>Issue Type</i>	<i>Summary/Comment</i>
09/25/2007	Nelson Ladd	SR51 & I-10	Meeting minutes	ADOT	Freeway	Asked about future plans to lessen the congestion on the SR51 and I-10.
09/25/2007	Jack Lunsford	Financial	Meeting minutes	Other	Financial	He would like to see an agreement with STAN II Funding for projects in the southwest valley as soon as possible..
10/10/2007	Gary Green	Light Rail Safety	email	RPTA	Transit	Feels strongly the Light Rail is inherently unsafe because it doesn't have a protected/exclusive right-of-way for its tracks, but shares with pedestrians, fire, police, bicycles, buses, cars and trucks.
10/26/2007	Gary Green	Light Rail Accident	email	RPTA	Transit	He doesn't feel the voters of Phoenix and neighboring cities were fully informed on the human cost that will accompany the unsafe design of Light Rail.
11/15/2007	Joseph Ryan	Light Rail Safety	email	RPTA	Transit	Upset about Valley Metro Rail purchasing computer software for the Light Rail that will override the ITS system creating increased safety and air pollutant issues.
11/22/2007	Gary Green	Light Rail Fatalities	email	RPTA	Transit	He submitted two news articles on Light Rail fatalities in Minneapolis and New Jersey due to poor safety design.
12/22/2007	Gary Green	Light Rail Safety	email	RPTA	Transit	He submitted another report of a fatality in New Jersey and stated its time for the news media to shine the light on the dangers of Light Rail.

APPENDIX C

CTOC STATUTE

28-6356. Citizens transportation oversight committee

A. A citizens transportation oversight committee is established in counties with a population of one million two hundred thousand or more persons and that have levied a transportation excise tax pursuant to section 42-6104 or 42-6105.

B. The citizens transportation oversight committee consists of the following members who are not elected officials of or employed by this state or any county, city or town in this state:

1. One member who serves as chairperson of the committee and who is appointed by the governor pursuant to section 38-211.

2. One member who represents each supervisorial district in the county and who is appointed by the board of supervisors. The board of supervisors shall consult with the mayors of each city and town located within each supervisorial district regarding appointments. At all times during the term, each member appointed pursuant to this paragraph shall legally reside in a different city or town located in the county. Members appointed pursuant to this paragraph shall have expertise in transportation systems or issues.

3. One member who resides in the county and who is appointed by the governor pursuant to section 38-211.

C. Members shall be appointed for terms of three years.

D. The chairperson shall also serve as:

1. A nonvoting member of the departmental committee established by section 28-6951 only for issues relating to the regional transportation plan. The chairperson may appoint a designee to attend meetings of the departmental committee.

2. A voting member of the governing body of the regional planning agency in the county for all matters relating to the regional transportation plan.

3. A voting member of the transportation policy committee of the regional planning agency under section 28-6308 in the county for all matters relating to the regional transportation plan.

E. The citizens transportation oversight committee shall meet at least once each calendar quarter.

F. The citizens transportation oversight committee shall:

1. Review and advise the board, the governor, the director, the governing body of the regional planning agency and the board of directors of the regional public transportation authority on matters relating to all projects funded pursuant to section 42-6104 and in the regional transportation plan.

2. Review and make recommendations regarding any proposed major amendment of the regional transportation plan by the governing body of the regional planning agency pursuant to section 28-6353.

3. Annually review and comment on the criteria developed pursuant to section 28-6354, subsection B.

4. Hold public hearings and issue public reports as it deems appropriate.

5. Annually contract with an independent auditor who is a certified public accountant to conduct a financial compliance audit of all expenditures from the regional area road fund and the public transportation fund and receive the auditor's report. The department shall reimburse the committee for the cost of this audit from the highway user revenue fund pursuant to section 28-6538, subsection B, paragraph 1.

6. In consultation with the auditor general, set parameters for the performance audit prescribed in section 41-1279.03, subsection A, paragraph 6 in the county, review the results of the auditor general's performance audit and make recommendations to the regional planning agency, the regional public transportation authority, the department, the speaker of the house of representatives, the president of the senate and the governor.

G. The committee may:

1. Receive written complaints from citizens regarding adverse impacts of any transportation project funded in the regional transportation plan, determine which complaints warrant further review and make recommendations to the state transportation board regarding the complaints.

2. Receive written complaints from citizens relating to the regional planning agency's responsibilities as prescribed in this chapter, determine which complaints warrant further review and make recommendations to the regional planning agency regarding the complaints.

3. Make recommendations to the regional planning agency, the regional public transportation authority and the state transportation board regarding transportation projects and public transportation

systems funded in the regional transportation plan, the transportation improvement program, the department's five year construction program and the life cycle management program.

H. Failure by the citizens transportation oversight committee to act does not bar the governing body of the regional planning agency or the board of directors of the regional public transportation authority from taking action.

I. Members of the committee are not eligible to receive compensation or reimbursement for expenses.

APPENDIX D

2005 PERFORMANCE AUDIT STATUS

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
A REVIEW OF THE OVERSIGHT AND MANAGEMENT OF THE
MARICOPA COUNTY REGIONAL FREEWAY SYSTEM

12-Month Follow-Up Report To
Auditor General Report No. 05-CR1

FINDING: A review of the oversight and management of the Maricopa County Regional Freeway System

Recommendation	Status of Implementing Recommendation
<p>1. Continue to improve and implement successful project management practices, both through the completion of the Accelerated Program and in the implementation of new RFS programming, including the current change order review and approval process.</p>	<p>Recommendation completed with implementation of the following three administrative actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improvements to the Project Development Process Manual (refer to attachment A). The purpose of the Manual is to describe the project Development Process and to provide a guide for the management of project scoping activities, project design and production of construction documents, administration of construction contracts, and initial project operation and maintenance in accordance with ADOT policy. 2. Improvements to the Construction Manual (refer to attachment B). The Construction Manual describes change order and approval process. 3. Establishment of new full time positions to implement successful project management practices for the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).
<p>2. Develop and implement a memorialization and retention policy for documentation of approved project changes and key project decisions, which enables easy documentation location and review.</p>	<p>Recommendation completed by DMJM Harris chronology of RTP includes documentation in the form of a summary of key administrative, financial, environmental and engineering decisions of RTP project development. Refer to attachment C, for example of project development chronology.</p>
<p>a. ADOT should consider developing a checklist to keep in the centralized project files that indicates all the types of documentation to be included in the file, so that at any point, a project file could reasonably be expected to provide a comprehensive overview of changes to the project and/or other key project decisions throughout the project's development.</p>	<p>Recommendation completed with implementation of the following two administrative actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ADOT developed project folders to keep in the centralized project files in the Data Warehouse database (refer to attachment D). Project Managers participated in "Information Data Warehouse" training program. 2. Hired three Management Consultants (DMJM Harris, HDR and PB) to maintain centralized project files that indicates the types of documentation to be included in

Recommendation	Status of Implementing Recommendation
	the file for their respectable corridors.
<p>3. Develop a single database, or a system of coordinated databases, which is capable of generating reports that track, present, and explain the history of a project's incremental and cumulative development including budgeted to actual costs, timeline, and scope changes. Ideally, this system should allow queries and reports for individual projects, whole corridors, and the Accelerated Program (and/or the Proposition 400 program) overall.</p>	<p>Recommendation completed with implementation of the following three administrative actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development of "Information Data Warehouse (refer to attachment D)" database. 2. Improved <u>F</u>ield Office <u>A</u>utomation <u>S</u>ystem (FAST) database (refer to attachment E). The FAST database keep track on the history of a project budget, actual costs and milestone dates. 3. Development of a new database by ADOT's Information Technology Group represents the Department's formal action to provide a single database for tracking all RTP expenditures. Formalization of this comprehensive effort has been identified as ADOT's Datamart program which provides a centralized, dynamic repository available for immediate availability to ADOT management and staff through personal computer access. Refer to attachment F.
<p>a. Additionally, in the process of establishing a method of retrieving consolidated data, we recommend that ADOT examine opportunities to allocate indirect and/or apply direct project costs currently captured as "system-wide" expenditures for the purposes of Life Cycle Certification Reporting on corridor-specified obligations.</p>	<p>Recommendation completed. ADOT has improved a cost accounting program identified a <u>T</u>ransportation <u>A</u>ccounting <u>S</u>ystem (TRACS) which documents all costs attributed to the design, right of way and construction of the RTP. TRACS provides both a historical database and accounting of system-wide charges.</p>
<p>b. We also recommend that ADOT define and track right-of-way acquisition budgets and budget changes to watch for opportunities to increase its ability to anticipate the impact of the right-of-way acquisition process on the overall project budget.</p>	<p>Recommendation completed. ADOT completed preparation of a report documenting its acquisition costs and related budgetary changes. Refer to attachment G. Additionally, the Right of Way Section established full time positions responsible for monitoring and documenting budget projections, actual expenditures and results of condemnation actions.</p>

<p>4. Require comparisons of historical budgets and estimated completion dates—and the memorialized explanations for all prior changes to them—when evaluating newly proposed changes. Proposed changes should also require the presentation of impact on key performance indicators established for the RFS program and other metrics of comparison to enable analysis of cost-efficiency and effectiveness (e.g. budgeted, estimated, and actual costs per mile for similar projects.)</p>	<p>Recommendation completed by DMJM Harris chronology of RTP includes documentation in the form of a summary of key administrative, financial, environmental and engineering decisions of RTP project development. Refer to attachment C, for example of project development chronology.</p> <p>Additionally, DMJM Harris, other responsible management consultants and Valley Transportation Group is in process of developing a Cost Estimate Assessment Report providing a comprehensive review of current freeway construction and right of way costs associated with implementation of the RTP. The document includes the latest dynamics of market factors specific to construction and right of way costs impacting freeway construction in Maricopa County.</p>
<p>5. Define key performance indicators for the RFS program that will help ADOT, MAG, and STB recognize trends of performance that might trigger greater analysis for opportunities to improve cost-efficiency and effectiveness. For example, consider setting and tracking program success at delivering projects within 95 percent of the original schedule, or having actual project costs come within 10 percent of the first design estimate (plus inflation)—and/or other indicators, as proposed by ADOT, MAG, and/or STB.</p>	<p>Recommendation completed. The State Engineer's Office developed performance measures which provide baseline measurements for the Intermodal Transportation Division delivery within schedule and budget. Refer to attachment H for a representative report.</p> <p>Additionally, ADOT's Program and Project Management Section is in process of developing performance charts for the RTP freeway program. Draft report due in April 2008. Refer to attachment I.</p>
<p>6. Require separate tracking, monitoring, and reporting on the completion, including funding and actual costs, of the Accelerated Program separately of the funding, costs, and timelines for initiatives resulting from the passage of Proposition 400.</p>	<p>Recommendation completed. Refinement of data collection, tracking reporting and cross-referenced of engineering, financial and right of way continues.</p>

***Cost Estimate Assessment Report**

Maricopa County has experienced an unprecedented escalation in the costs for labor, fuel, construction materials and right-of-way between 2003 through 2008 that has greatly influenced the total cost for each project. Population growth resulting in higher than anticipated traffic volume projections, design policy changes based on lessons-learned from the Regional Freeway System Program, unanticipated project features resulting from the design concept and environmental studies and unforeseen maintenance issues have also increased the cost of the proposed projects beyond the assumptions used with the original project estimates. In addition, the current downturn in the Maricopa County economy has resulted in a decrease in collections from the ½ cent Sales Tax and Highway User Revenue Fund (HURF) revenues that assists to fund the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) program.

Due to these concerns, the Department initiated an assessment of the current status of the RTP Freeway Program that includes the following Items:

- Evaluation of the growth in construction and right-of-way costs between 2003 and 2008, and future trends in these project costs
Evaluation of project costs to determine how the project costs have changed since the inception of the RTP Freeway Program.
- Determine the portion of the additional costs attributable to the recent escalation of the costs for construction labor, materials, and right-of-way acquisition.
- Evaluation of the projects to determine the portion of the costs attributable to unforeseen conditions (scope change) resulting from the design concept and environmental studies.
- Updating the RTP Freeway Program costs for each project based upon refined project requirements and updated construction and right-of-way costs.

The results of this evaluation will allow ADOT and MAG to work together to evaluate potential adjustments to the RTP Freeway Program that will allow the program to move forward into the future.

The Department plans to perform a cost estimate assessment periodically every few years depending on the need to address changing costs.

APPENDIX E

CTOC BUDGET

CITIZEN'S TRANSPORTATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

FY 2007-2008 Budget

<i>APPROPRIATION</i>	<i>DESCRIPTION</i>	<i>ALLOCATION</i>
<i>0600</i>	<i>Personal Services</i>	<i>\$20,000</i>
<i>0610</i>	<i>Employee Related Expenses</i>	<i>\$7,000</i>
<i>0620</i>	<i>Professional & Outside Services *</i>	<i>\$17,000</i>
<i>0650</i>	<i>Travel - In State</i>	<i>\$1,000</i>
<i>0700</i>	<i>Other Operating Expenses **</i>	<i>\$7,000</i>
<i>0850</i>	<i>Non-Capital Equipment</i>	<i>\$1,000</i>
	<i>Total Operating Budget</i>	<i>\$53,000</i>

* Includes approximately \$14,000 for FY07 Financial Compliance Audit and meeting transcription costs.

** Includes meeting costs, mailings, printing, publication, advertising, equipment usage, room fees and refreshments.

APPENDIX F

JANUARY 2008 CERTIFICATION MAP

January 2008 Certification

Regional Transportation Plan Freeway Program 2006 - 2025

